arXiv:1402.6321v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 25 Feb 2014

Coherent Transmutation of Electrons into Fractionalized Anyons

Maissam Barkeshli,[1] Erez Berg,[2] and Steven Kivelson[3]

[1]*Station Q, Microsoft Research, Santa Barbara, California 93106, USA*
[2]*Department of Condensed Matter Physics, Weizmann Institute of Science, Rehovot, 76100, Israel*
[3]*Department of Physics, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305, USA*

Electrons have three quantized properties – charge, spin, and Fermi statistics – that are directly responsible for a vast array of phenomena observed in nature. Here we show how these properties can be coherently and dynamically stripped from the electron as it enters certain exotic states of matter known as quantum spin liquids (QSL). In a QSL, electron spins collectively form a highly entangled quantum state that gives rise to emergent gauge forces and fractionalization of spin, charge, and statistics. We show that certain QSLs host distinct, topologically robust boundary types, some of which allow the electron to coherently enter the QSL as a fractionalized quasiparticle, leaving its spin, charge, or statistics "at the door." We use these ideas to propose a number of universal, "smoking-gun" experimental signatures that would establish fractionalization in QSLs.

Introduction – One of the most striking examples of emergence in physics is *fractionalization*, where the long-wavelength, low-energy excitations of a quantum phase of matter possess quantum numbers that are fractions of those of the microscopic constituents. In a fractional quantum Hall (FQH) state for example, the emergent quasiparticle excitations carry fractional electric charge and "anyonic" quantum statistics. In a quantum spin liquid (QSL), the electron fractionalizes at low energies into two quasiparticles – spinons and holons – which independently carry the spin and charge of the electron [1–18]. When an electron is injected into these systems, it can decay into these fractionalized components, while a direct quantum mechanical coupling between the electron and a single fractionalized quasiparticle has conventionally been thought to be impossible. Consequently, the question of how to experimentally detect fractionalization in a QSL, even in principle, has remained a major challenge for decades. It is particularly timely to revisit this question, given that there are now a number of materials which have been shown to exhibit anomalous properties which may indicate that they are QSLs - for a review, see [17].

In this paper, we show that some QSLs allow electrons to *coherently* enter through their boundary as a fractionalized quasiparticle, leaving their charge, spin, or even Fermi statistics "at the door." We show that this leads to universal experimental signatures that can provide "smoking gun" evidence for fractionalization in QSLs. Our considerations are based on recent theoretical breakthroughs regarding a new window into the physics of two-dimensional topologically ordered states associated with extrinsic line and point defects [19–30], of which robust boundary phenomena are a special case.

Much of this paper will be focused on explaining the phenomena in the context of the simplest gapped two-dimensional QSL, which is referred to as the Z_2 short-ranged resonating valence bond state (sRVB) state, and explaining how it can be distinguished from non-fractionalized magnetic insulators, or even from QSLs with different types of fractionalization. To do this, we will build on recent results (reviewed below) that demonstrate that gapped fractionalized phases support topologically distinct types of gapped boundaries [21, 24]. These results imply that the Z_2 sRVB state *necessarily* supports exactly two topologically distinct types of gapped boundaries, which will be referred to as the e-edge and the m-edge, [49] and which are separated by a topological quantum phase transition.

In this paper, we will elucidate the physical conditions under which the sRVB state realizes the e or the m edge. We will show that it is possible to tune through the topological quantum phase transition between them by tuning external magnetic fields, or by coupling the boundary of the QSL to conventionally ordered states such as superconductors or non-collinear spin density wave states. We will show that the e edge in the Z_2 sRVB state allows electrons to coherently enter as a fractionalized quasiparticle! In particular, we will describe conditions under which the electron can leave its spin, charge, or even Fermi statistics at the edge and coherently pass through into the spin liquid as a neutral spin-1/2 particle (a spinon) or a charged spinless particle (holon). We will discuss methods to detect this phenomenon, which can establish fractionalization for a wide variety of spin liquids, including gapless ones, and even rule out certain topological orders.

There is a useful analogy here with "Tomasch oscillations" observed long ago in the context of superconducting films [31]. These oscillations reflect processes in which an electron with energy in excess of the superconducting gap tunnels coherently from a metal into a superconductor, where it becomes a Bogouliubov quasiparticle [32]. There is a well-defined sense [33] in which the quasiparticles in a conventional superconductor are neutral spinons, although the broken gauge symmetry of the superconductor makes this analogy somewhat subtle.

We will also discuss how the topological quantum phase transition between the e and m edge can be detected experimentally, through *eg* thermal conductivity measurements. The observation of a topological

phase transition– a quantum phase transition without any change of symmetry and no local order parameter – on the edge could also provide a universal experimental signature that would rule out all non-fractionalized phases, and even fractionalized ones that support only one type of gapped boundary.

Review of sRVB and topological order – The Z_2 sRVB state is an insulating, spin-rotationally invariant gapped spin liquid state. That it is a legitimate state of matter has been proven by constructing model Hamiltonians which have exact sRVB ground-states[11–13, 34]. At low energies, there are four topologically distinct types of elementary quasiparticle excitations: (1) local, topologically trivial excitations, which can be built out of local combinations of electrons, (2) spinons and holons, which carry spin-1/2 and charge 0, or spin 0 and charge 1, respectively, (3) visons, which do not carry spin or charge and which have mutually semionic statistics with respect to the spinons and holons, and (4) the bound state of a spinon or holon with a vison. Note that since electrons always carry both unit electric charge and spin-1/2, the spinons and holons cannot be created by any local combinations of electron operators, and are therefore topological quasiparticle excitations. Nevertheless, the spinons and holons are topologically equivalent, as they differ from each other by binding to an electron. Also, the spinons and holons can be either bosonic or fermionic, depending on detailed energetics.

The Z_2 sRVB state can be understood at low energies in terms of Z_2 lattice gauge theory. In this language, the spinons and holons carry the Z_2 gauge charge, while the visons are the Z_2 fluxes. As a result, the spinons and holons are sometimes referred to as the e particles, while the visons are referred to as the m particles. This state can also be described at long wavelengths using Abelian Chern-Simons (CS) field theory [15, 16]:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{4\pi} K^{IJ} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda} a^I_\mu \partial_\nu a^J_\lambda + \mathcal{L}_{matter}, \qquad (1)$$

where K is an integer symmetric matrix, $\mu, \nu, \lambda = 0, 1, 2$ are 2+1D space-time indices, and $\mathcal{L}_{matter}$ describes the quasiparticles that are minimally coupled to the $U(1)$ gauge field a^I, for $I = 1, \cdots, rank(K)$. In this language, the quasiparticles are characterized by an integer vector $\boldsymbol{l}$, which indicates their charges under the gauge fields a^I. The CS term associates the statistical angle, $\theta_{\boldsymbol{l}} = \pi \boldsymbol{l}^T K^{-1} \boldsymbol{l}$, with each particle, while two different quasiparticles $\boldsymbol{l}$ and $\boldsymbol{l}'$ have mutual statistics $\theta_{\boldsymbol{ll}'} = 2\pi \boldsymbol{l}^T K^{-1} \boldsymbol{l}'$; the statistical angle is the phase change obtained under adiabatic braiding of two quasiparticles. Two quasiparticles $\boldsymbol{l}$ and $\boldsymbol{l}'$ are topologically equivalent if $\boldsymbol{l} = \boldsymbol{l}' + K\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$, where $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$ is an integer vector; the number of topologically distinct quasiparticles is $|DetK|$.

The Z_2 sRVB state is described by $K = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 \\ 2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$; the e particle (spinon or holon) is described by the vector $(1, 0)$, while the m particle (vison) is described by $(0, 1)$. Another simple, time-reversal invariant possible spin liquid state is the "doubled-semion" state [15, 35] $K = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}$. This has quasiparticles s, described by $(1, 0)$ and $\bar{s}$, described by $(0, 1)$, which have "semionic" statistics $\theta_s = \pi/2 = -\theta_{\bar{s}}$, while their composite $s\bar{s}$, described by $(1, 1)$, is a boson.

Evidence of gapped spin-liquid ground states has been adduced from clever numerical studies of spin 1/2 frustrated Heisenberg models[36–39], but it is not yet clear which of these two candidate phases has been realized.

Review of defects and gapped boundaries– It has recently been shown that each topologically ordered phase, characterized by a matrix K, can have topologically distinct types of gapped boundaries [21, 23, 24] (see also [25, 26]). These are in one-to-one correspondence with certain subgroups of fractionalized quasiparticles, called Lagrangian subgroups. A Lagrangian subgroup M is a maximal subgroup of mutually bosonic quasiparticles that satisfies two conditions: (1) For every $\boldsymbol{m},\ \boldsymbol{m}' \in M$, $e^{i\theta_{\boldsymbol{mm}'}} = 1$, and (2) For every $\boldsymbol{l} \notin M$, there exists some $\boldsymbol{m} \in M$ such that $e^{i\theta_{\boldsymbol{lm}}} \neq 1$. The first condition guarantees that all particles in M are mutually local with respect to each other, while (2) guarantees that every particle not in M has non-trivial statistics with respect to at least one particle in M. The physical characteristic of a gapped boundary characterized by M is that the topological quasiparticles in M can be created or annihilated near the boundary by local operators, even though they are non-local topological excitations in the bulk of the system [21, 24]. As an example, the Z_2 sRVB state has two different Lagrangian subgroups, $(1, e)$ and $(1, m)$, and therefore has two topologically distinct types of gapped boundaries. The doubled semion theory has only one Lagrangian subgroup, consisting of $(1, s\bar{s})$, and therefore has only one type of gapped boundary.

There are two complementary ways of understanding these results. As we discuss in the Supplemental Material, starting from the Z_2 lattice gauge theory for the Z_2 sRVB state, the edge theory can be obtained by integrating out the (always gapped) bulk degrees of freedom. From this perspective, there are still two *topologically distinct* phases, corresponding to the two topologically distinct boundary types, distinguished by whether the Z_2 gauge symmetry is broken on the edge or not. The phases are topologically distinct because there is no local order parameter than can distinguish the Z_2 gauge symmetry breaking. The fact that the doubled semion model has only one type of gapped boundary can also be understood from a similar point of view.

Alternatively, the edge theory can be derived by starting with the Abelian CS theory (1). It is well-known [16] that on a manifold with a boundary, in order to preserve gauge invariance, the bulk field theory in Eq. (1) must

be accompanied by an edge Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{4\pi} K_{IJ} \partial_x \phi^I \partial_t \phi^J - V_{IJ} \partial_x \phi_I \partial_x \phi_J, \qquad (2)$$

where V_{IJ} is a positive-definite "velocity matrix." The number of left (right) movers is given by the number of positive (negative) eigenvalues of the K matrix. In this edge theory, $[\phi^I(x), \phi^J(y)] = i\pi K^{-1}_{IJ} sgn(x-y)$. The quasiparticle operators on the edge are $\chi_{\boldsymbol{l}} = e^{i\boldsymbol{l}^T \phi}$, while operators of the form $e^{i\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^T K \phi}$, for integer vectors $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}$, describe topologically trivial excitations. Therefore, there can be local terms on the edge of the form

$$\delta\mathcal{L} = \sum_i \alpha_i \cos(\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i^T K \phi + \beta_i), \qquad (3)$$

where α_i and β_i are (possibly position dependent) coupling constants. Under certain conditions [24, 40], such a term can create an energy gap between counterpropagating edge modes and even lead to a completely gapped edge if there are an equal number of left and right movers. (If the resulting gaps are large, the field theory description of the edge is no longer controlled, but since the most important qualitative features of a gapped state do not depend on the magnitude of the gap, the field theory description of such phases should be adequate for present purposes – more formally, it gives a leading order description of the edge modes in the vicinity of an edge quantum critical point where the edge gaps, but not the bulk gaps are vanishingly small.) It can be shown explicitly that for every Lagrangian subgroup M, there is a choice of $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_i$ that leads to a completely gapped edge, and that edges characterized by different M are *topologically* distinct [21, 24].

In the case of the Z_2 sRVB state, the edge theory maps onto a single-channel Luttinger liquid, as there are two conjugate modes, $\phi \equiv \phi_1$ and $\theta \equiv \phi_2$, with $[\phi(x), \theta(y)] = i\frac{\pi}{2} sgn(x-y)$, and two basic types of local backscattering terms: $\delta\mathcal{L}_{Z_2} = \lambda_m \cos(2\phi) + \lambda_e \cos(2\theta)$. Since ϕ and θ are conjugate, the cosine terms cannot simultaneously pin their arguments, so there are two distinct phases. If λ_m and λ_e are both asymptotically small, which one dominates, *i.e.* which field gets pinned, depends on which is more perturbatively relevant, which in turn depends on the value of the coupling constants K_{IJ} and V_{IJ}. For larger values, the result also depends on λ_m/λ_e. Where $|\lambda_m|$ is the dominant coupling, $\langle e^{i\phi} \rangle \neq 0$ and $\langle e^{i\theta} \rangle = 0$. Conversely, if $|\lambda_e|$ is dominant, $\langle e^{i\theta} \rangle \neq 0$ and $\langle e^{i\phi} \rangle = 0$. The two phases are topologically distinct, because $e^{i\phi}$ and $e^{i\theta}$ are non-local quasiparticle operators on the edge. In the absence of any additional global symmetries, there is a single quantum critical point between these two gapped phases in the Ising universality class (see the Supplemental Materials for additional discussion).

In the presence of spin rotation and charge conservation symmetries, the modes ϕ and θ must represent either low-energy spin or charge fluctuations (but not both), depending on the physical situation. If they describe charge fluctuations, then the charge density is given by $\rho_c = \frac{1}{\pi}\partial_x \phi$, and $h = e^{i\theta + in\phi}$ creates a holon which is bosonic for even integer n and fermonic for odd. The operator $e^{2i\theta}$ is a topologically trivial excitation that carries charge-2 and no spin, and therefore is physically equivalent to a Cooper pair. Alternatively, if the boson modes describe spin fluctuations, then the spin density is $S^z = \frac{1}{2\pi}\partial_x \phi$, and $S^{\pm} = e^{\pm i2\theta}$. The operator $e^{\pm i\theta + in\phi}$ creates a spin-1/2 spinon which is bosonic or fermionic for n, respectively, even or odd.

Edge physics	Edge type
Spin/charge conserved	m
Heisenberg exchange to collinear SDW	m
Heisenberg exchange $J > J_c$ to N.C. SDW	e
Magnetic field $B > B_c$ at edge of XXZ system	e
Pair tunneling $t_{pair} > t^c_{pair}$ to superconductor	e

TABLE I: Summary of conditions under which e edge can be realized in the Z_2 sRVB. Aside from the XXZ case with the applied magnetic field B, the QSL is assumed to be $SO(3)$ spin rotationally invariant. The first two cases can, in principle, also be gapless.

Realizing e- and m- edges – In the presence of spin and charge conservation, no local operator can possibly create a spinon or holon at the edge of a Z_2 sRVB state. This is because all local operators are built out of electron operators, which have both unit charge and spin-1/2. Within the edge theory above, we see that charge/spin conservation would preclude the term $\cos(2\theta)$, and only allow the term $\cos(2\phi)$. *It follows that an e edge is incompatible with spin and charge conservation; the m-edge is the generic gapped boundary of a Z_2 sRVB, if charge and spin are conserved.*

We will now explore how an e edge can be realized in a physically realistic system. In an XXZ spin model, which has spin symmetry $U(1) \rtimes Z_2$, an e edge can be realized by applying a sufficiently strong magnetic field at the boundary with a component in the easy-plane ($U(1)$) direction. Alternatively, an e edge can be realized in a fully spin rotationally invariant, charge conserving Z_2 spin liquid by coupling the boundary of the spin liquid sufficiently strongly to either a non-collinear spin density wave (NC SDW) state through spin exchange couplings, or to a paired superconductor through Cooper pair tunneling. These results are summarized in Table I.

Let us begin by considering a realization of a Z_2 sRVB state with easy-plane, or XXZ, spin-rotational symmetry. Again, this can be treated from the perspective of an Ising gauge theory (as discussed in the Supplemental Materials) or from the field theory perspective. In the bosonized edge theory, the S^z spin density is given by $S^z = \frac{1}{2\pi}\partial_x \phi$, while $S^{\pm} = e^{\pm i2\theta}$. The bulk $U(1)$ spin

rotational symmetry is associated with the global transformation $\theta \to \theta + f$, and therefore so long as this symmetry is not explicitly broken, terms which would pin θ, such as $\cos(2\theta)$, are disallowed. However, a magnetic field applied along the edge leads to a term $-\mu B \cos(2\theta)$, which for strong enough magnetic field can produce an edge topological phase transition to an e edge.

Now let us consider coupling a paired superconductor to the edge of a spin liquid. For simplicity we will consider a singlet superconductor, although the same results apply for the triplet superconductor. At low energies the dominant couplings between the superconductor and the spin liquid include Cooper pair tunneling and spin exchange terms:

$$\mathcal{H}_{edge} = t_{pair}(\Phi^\dagger_{qsl}\Phi_{sc} + H.c.) + J\vec{S}_{qsl}\cdot\vec{S}_{sc} \qquad (4)$$

where Φ_{sc} ($\vec{S}_{sc}$) is the Cooper pair (spin operator) on the edge of the superconductor, and Φ_{qsl} ($\vec{S}_{qsl}$) is the Cooper pair (spin operator) on the edge of the QSL. Φ_{sc} can be replaced by a c-number since the Cooper pairs are condensed in the superconductor. The first term therefore prefers to condense pairs of holons, which are the Cooper pairs on the spin liquid edge. In the bosonized field theory, this term corresponds to a perturbation $\delta\mathcal{L}_{pair} \propto t_{pair}\langle\Phi_{sc}\rangle\cos(2\theta)$, where recall the charge density is $\rho_c = \frac{1}{\pi}\partial_x\phi$. When t_{pair} is stronger than the energy gap of the m edge, this term drives a phase transition into the e edge, where single holons are also condensed: $\langle e^{i\theta}\rangle \neq 0$. Note that the Cooper pair tunneling does not need to overcome the charge gap of the Z_2 spin liquid, which is typically extremely large. By tuning the chemical potential in the superconductor using a gate voltage, the Cooper pair tunneling only needs to be larger than the gap of the m-edge, which is expected to be on the order of the spin gap of the QSL. In the absence of pair tunneling, it is not clear to what extent spin exchange coupling with the superconductor will favor the e edge; we leave a detailed study of this for future work.

A similar analysis shows that strong Heisenberg exchange coupling to a non-collinear SDW also can realize the e edge. Furthermore, coupling an $SO(3)$ spin rotationally invariant QSL to a collinear SDW (Néel state) is not sufficient to realize the e edge, because the Néel state has a residual $U(1)$ spin rotation symmetry that precludes spinon condensation.

Generalized Tomasch oscillations – In the Z_2 sRVB, the electron c_α can be thought of as a composite of a bosonic holon b and a fermionic spinon f_α: $c_\alpha = bf_\alpha$, where $\alpha = \uparrow, \downarrow$. When the e edge is created by strong Cooper pair tunneling from a paired superconductor, the bosonic holon is condensed on the edge. Consequently, any electron tunneling term along the boundary between the QSL and the superconductor becomes:

$$\delta\mathcal{H}_{edge} = tc^\dagger_{qsl}c_{sc} + h.c. = t\langle b_{qsl}\rangle f^\dagger_{qsl}c_{sc} + h.c. \qquad (5)$$



FIG. 1: Proposed geometries to observe geometric resonances (generalized Tomasch oscillations) in QSLs. d_{qsl} and d_{sc} are the widths of the QSL and superconducting regions, respectively. (a) An e edge is created by coupling to a superconductor, in which case an electron can coherently enter the Z_2 sRVB as a fermionic spinon f. (b) At the domain wall between e and m edges there is a Majorana fermion zero mode, allowing electrons to coherently pass into the QSL as a *bosonic* spinon z by emitting a vison v at the m edge. (c) An e edge is created by coupling a spin-rotationally invariant QSL to a non-collinear SDW, allowing an electron to coherently enter the QSL as a fermionic holon, h. (d) The Majorana fermion zero mode at the domain wall allows an electron to coherently enter the QSL as a bosonic holon, b. In (a)-(d), oscillations in $I(V)$ with a period determined by d_{qsl}, *without* oscillations in the bulk current $I_b(V_b)$, would provide a smoking gun signature of fractionalization in the QSL.

Thus, at the e edge with a superconductor, the electron can coherently tunnel into the spin liquid as a fermionic spinon by leaving its charge behind in the superconductor! This would not be allowed at the m edge, where the electron would tunnel into the spin liquid as a whole. Depending on details of the energetics of the excitations in the QSL, the electron can subsequently decay into a holon and a spinon.

The possibility of a direct coupling between electrons and fractionalized quasiparticles opens a new realm of possible probes of QSLs. Given the existence of a material with a Z_2 sRVB ground state and stable fermionic spinon quasiparticles, a direct experimental signature of such coherent fractionalization of the electron could be obtained by detecting a suitably generalized version of Tomasch oscillations: Consider the local electron density of states (LDOS), measured at the boundary of the superconductor, for the finite strip geometry shown in Fig. 1a. This will receive contributions from processes where superconducting quasiparticles coherently propagate into the spin liquid as fermionic spinons, reflect off the outer boundary, and propagate back. If the spinon mean free path is larger than the width d_{qsl} of the QSL,

this leads to coherent oscillations of the LDOS as a function of the dimensionless ratio $eVd_{qsl}/\hbar v_{qsl}$ for voltages V larger than both the spinon and superconducting gaps, where v_{qsl} is the spinon velocity in the QSL. Moreover, incontrovertible evidence that the oscillations are associated with charge neutral excitations can be obtained by simultaneously monitoring the bulk current, I_b in the figure, which in this case will be parametrically small and free of signatures of coherent spinon interference. Note that for an m edge, there would be no such coherent oscillations, as the electron must enter into the QSL as a whole, and would subsequently decay into a spinon and holon.

Similar phenomena will occur when the e edge is created through magnetic effects, such as through a magnetic field applied at the edge, or through coupling to a non-collinear SDW. In these cases, the bosonic spinon is condensed at the edge. We can write the electron operator as $c_\alpha = hz_\alpha$, where z_α is a bosonic spinon, and h is a fermionic holon. Now, the electron tunneling Hamiltonian at the edge becomes $\delta\mathcal{H}_{edge} \propto t_{\alpha\beta}\langle z_\alpha\rangle h^\dagger_{qsl} c_{\beta;sdw} + h.c.$, where here we have included a spin-dependent tunneling matrix element $t_{\alpha\beta}$. *Thus, the electron in this case can propagate coherently into the spin liquid as a fermionic holon.* If fermionic holons are stable fractionalized quasiparticles, we again expect to observe the Tomasch oscillations in finite strip geometries (Fig. 1c).

Treating the case of *gapless* spin liquids in a theoretically controlled manner is more difficult than the case of gapped spin liquids. However, it is worth noting that in gapless spin liquids that support long-lived spinons (such as Z_2 spin liquids with Dirac points in their spinon spectrum), generalized Tomasch oscillations of the sort envisaged here would likely occur, as well.

Majorana fermion zero modes– A domain wall between topologically distinct types of boundary localizes exotic topological zero modes that give rise to topologically protected degeneracies and projective non-Abelian statistics [21]. In the case of the Z_2 sRVB state, the domain wall between e and m edges localizes a Majorana fermion zero mode, with the following physical consequences.

Let us consider the case of the superconductivity-induced e edge, where an electron can coherently enter the QSL as a fermionic spinon. If this process occurs in the vicinity of the domain wall between an e and m edge, then the fermionic spinon can also emit or absorb a vison from the m edge, thus becoming a bosonic spinon. In other words, the Majorana fermion zero mode is a source/sink of *fermion parity*, allowing the electron to coherently enter into the spin liquid as a *bosonic* spinon. If the fermionic spinon in the bulk of the QSL can decay into a vison and a bosonic spinon, then this geometry (Fig. 1b) will allow the Tomasch oscillations to be observed in the tunneling conductance. Similar considerations show that when the e edge is induced by magnetism, the electron can enter into the spin liquid as a *bosonic holon* in the vicinity of the e-m domain wall (Fig. 1d).

Boundary topological phase transition– Two different types of gapped edges in a Z_2 spin liquid are separated by a topological quantum phase transition. The considerations of this paper suggest ways to tune through this transition. The simplest one is a magnetic field applied to the edge of an XXZ, or easy-plane, QSL. This can be done by taking a thin sample and shielding the bulk of the QSL by sandwiching it between two superconductors. When the Zeeman energy exceeds the spin gap on the edge, there will be a topological quantum phase transition from an m to a e edge with no change in symmetry. At the quantum phase transition, the in-plane thermal conductivity in the direction of the edge receives contributions from phonons, the critical modes at the edge of the electronic system, and the bulk of the electronic system: $\kappa = \kappa_{ph} + \kappa_{edge} + \kappa_{bulk}$, with $\kappa_{edge} = N_L c\frac{\pi^2}{3}\frac{k_B^2}{h}T$, $\kappa_{ph} \propto AT^3$, and $\kappa_{bulk} \propto e^{-\Delta/T}$. Here Δ is the bulk gap, N_L is the number of layers of the quasi-two-dimensional spin liquid whose edges are critical, c is the central charge of the quantum critical point. We see that this can be detected through a non-zero intercept at low temperatures: $\lim_{T\to 0}\kappa/T = N_L c\frac{\pi^2}{3}\frac{k_B^2}{h}$. Moreover, since κ_{ph} should be largely field-independent, it can be subtracted out.

Since neither the trivial paramagnet nor the doubled semion QSL have topologically distinct types of gapped boundaries, *the observation of a topological quantum phase transition at the edge of a gapped insulating spin system would prove the existence of a fractionalized spin liquid state, and rule out the doubled semion state.*

Acknowledgements– This work was supported by Microsoft Station Q (MB), NSF - DMR 1265593 (SK), the Israel Science Foundation (ISF), the Israel-US Binational Foundation (BSF), the Minerva foundation, and the German-Israeli Foundation (GIF) (EB). MB thanks Xiao-Liang Qi for recent collaborations on related topics, and C. Nayak, M. Freedman, Z. Wang, K. Walker, M. Hastings, M.P.A. Fisher, B. Bauer, and T. Grover for discussions.

[1] Fractionalization, and in particular spin-charge separation, are well documented in 1D systems - for a review, see [41]. However, the extension to higher dimensions is highly non-trivial, and requires the existence of emergent gauge structures.
[2] P. Anderson, Mater. Res. Bull. **8**, 153 (1973).
[3] P. Anderson, Science **235**, 1196 (1987).
[4] S. A. Kivelson, D. S. Rokhsar, and J. P. Sethna, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 8865 (1987).
[5] D. Thouless, Phys. Rev. B **36**, 7187 (1987).
[6] S. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 259 (1989).
[7] N. Read and B. Chakraborty, Phys. Rev. B **40**, 7133 (1989).
[8] X. G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **44**, 2664 (1991).

[9] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1773 (1991).
[10] T. Senthil and M. P. A. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B **62**, 7850 (2000).
[11] R. Moessner and S. L. Sondhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1881 (2001).
[12] L. Balents, M. P. A. Fisher, and S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. B **65**, 224412 (2002).
[13] T. Senthil and O. Motrunich, Phys. Rev. B **66**, 205104 (2002).
[14] P. A. Lee, N. Nagaosa, and X.-G. Wen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**, 17 (2006).
[15] M. Freedman, C. Nayak, K. Shtengel, K. Walker, and Z. Wang, Annals of Physics **310**, 428 (2004).
[16] X.-G. Wen, *Quantum Field Theory of Many-Body Systems* (Oxford Univ. Press, Oxford, 2004).
[17] L. Balents, Nature **464**, 199 (2010).
[18] P. A. Lee, Science **321**, 1306 (2008).
[19] M. Barkeshli and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. X **2**, 031013 (2012).
[20] M. Barkeshli, C.-M. Jian, and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. B **87**, 045130 (2013).
[21] M. Barkeshli, C.-M. Jian, and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 241103(R) (2013); M. Barkeshli, C.-M. Jian, and X.-L. Qi, Phys. Rev. B **88**, 235103 (2013).
[22] S. Beigi, P. W. Shor, and D. Whalen, Comm. Math. Phys. **306**, 663 (2011).
[23] A. Kitaev and L. Kong, Comm. Math. Phys. **313**, 351 (2012).
[24] M. Levin, Phys. Rev. X **3**, 021009 (2013).
[25] A. Kapustin and N. Saulina, Nucl. Phys. B **845**, 393 (2011).
[26] J. Fuchs, C. Schweigert, and A. Valentino, Communications in Mathematical Physics **321**, 543 (2013).
[27] N. H. Lindner, E. Berg, G. Refael, and A. Stern, Phys. Rev. X **2**, 041002 (2012).
[28] D. J. Clarke, J. Alicea, and K. Shtengel, Nature Comm. **4**, 1348 (2013), arXiv:1204.5479.
[29] M. Cheng, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 195126 (2012).
[30] J. Wang and X.-G. Wen (2012), arXiv:1212.4863.
[31] W. J. Tomasch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **15**, 672 (1965).
[32] W. L. McMillan and P. W. Anderson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 85 (1966).
[33] S. Kivelson and D. Rokhsar, Phys. Rev. B **41**, 11693 (1990), ISSN 0163-1829.
[34] D. Rokhsar and S. Kivelson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2376 (1988), ISSN 0031-9007.
[35] M. A. Levin and X.-G. Wen, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 045110 (2005).
[36] H.-C. Jiang, Z. Wang, and L. Balents, Nature Phys. **8**, 902 (2012).
[37] H.-C. Jiang, H. Yao, and L. Balents, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 024424 (2012).
[38] S. Yan, D. A. Huse, and S. R. White, Science **332**, 1173 (2011).
[39] S. Depenbrock, I. P. McCulloch, and U. Schollwöck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 067201 (2012).
[40] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2090 (1995).
[41] A. Heeger, S. Kivelson, J. Schrieffer, and W. Su, Reviews of Modern Physics **60**, 781 (1988), ISSN 0034-6861.
[42] A. Kitaev, Annals Phys. **303**, 2 (2003), arXiv:quant-ph/9707021.
[43] S. Bravyi and A. Y. Kitaev (1998), arXiv:quant-ph/9811052.
[44] T. Giamarchi, *Quantum Physics in One Dimension* (Clarendon press, Oxford, 2003).
[45] D. G. Shelton, A. A. Nersesyan, and A. M. Tsvelik, Phys. Rev. B **53**, 8521 (1996).
[46] H. J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. B **34**, 6372 (1986).
[47] M. Levin and Z.-C. Gu, Phys. Rev. B **86**, 115109 (2012).
[48] X. Chen, Z.-C. Gu, Z.-X. Liu, and X.-G. Wen, Science **338**, 1604 (2012), http://www.sciencemag.org/content/338/6114/1604.full.pdf.
[49] These were identified long ago in the toric code model [42] in terms of rough versus smooth edges [43], although the generic necessity to realize one or the other in RVB states and their general independence of lattice structure has only recently been fully appreciated.

Appendix A: Supplemental Materials

1. Absence of gapless phase at Z_2 sRVB edge

In the main text we argued that generically, in the absence of any global symmetry, the Luttinger liquid edge theory of the Z_2 sRVB will be in a gapped phase. Here we will briefly provide the details of this analysis.

Consider the Luttinger liquid edge theory of the Z_2 sRVB state, which we write as:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{\pi}\partial_x\phi\partial_t\theta - \frac{u}{2\pi}(K(\partial_x\theta)^2 + \frac{1}{K}(\partial_x\phi)^2). \tag{A1}$$

The two most relevant, allowed perturbations on the edge that lead to an energy gap are, as explained in the main text,

$$\delta\mathcal{L} = \lambda_m\cos(2\theta) + \lambda_e\cos(2\phi). \tag{A2}$$

For a Luttinger liquid parameter K, the operator $e^{i2\phi}$ has scaling dimension K, while $\cos(2\theta)$ has scaling dimension $1/K$ [44]. Therefore, λ_m is an irrelevant perturbation when $1/K > 2$, while λ_e is irrelevant when $K > 2$. We see that it is impossible for both to be irrelevant simultaneously. This implies that unless there is a symmetry which prohibits one of them to be zero, the gapless Luttinger liquid edge will be generically unstable to one of the two gapped edge phases.

At $K = 1$, the model in Eqs. (A1,A2) can be solved exactly by refermionization[45]. One finds a phase transition at $|\lambda_m| = |\lambda_e|$ of the Ising universality class. This is in agreement with the fact that this model can be viewed as a representation of a two-dimensional classical planar spin model with a two-fold anisotropy, which is expected to have similar properties to the two-dimensional Ising model[46].

Note that the discussion above is not the most general possible analysis, as we ignore any possible current-density coupling, $\partial_x\theta\partial_x\phi$, which breaks both inversion symmetry along the edge, $x \to -x$, and time reversal symmetry. We also assume translation symmetry to simplify the analysis. A more systematic analysis of the possible edge structure will include disorder as well, and is left for future work.

2. Z_2 gauge theory description

a. Z_2 sRVB

The long-wavelength effective theory of a Z_2 quantum spin liquid consists of a Z_2 gauge theory coupled to spinon and holon matter fields. Here, we use this effective theory to demonstrate that a transition from an $m-$edge to an $e-$edge can be induced by breaking either charge or spin symmetries at the edge.

The following effective Hamiltonian represents a lattice version of the low-energy theory:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{H} = &-J\sum_{\square}\prod_{\langle ij\rangle\in\square}\sigma^z_{ij} - \lambda\sum_{\langle ij\rangle}\sigma^x_{ij} - \sum_{\langle ij\rangle}\left(t_b\sigma^z_{ij}b^\dagger_i b_j + \sum_{\alpha=\uparrow,\downarrow}t_s\sigma^z_{ij}s^\dagger_{i\alpha}s_{j\alpha}\right)\\ &+\sum_i\left(m_b b^\dagger_i b_i + m_s\sum_{\alpha=\uparrow,\downarrow}s^\dagger_{i\alpha}s_{i\alpha}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

Here, σ^z_{ij} are Ising degrees of freedom residing on the links of a two-dimensional square lattice ($\langle ij\rangle$ are nearest neighbor sites), and $b^\dagger_i$, $s^\dagger_{i\alpha}$ are bosonic operators that create a holon or spinon with spin $\alpha =\uparrow,\downarrow$ on site i, respectively. $\sum_\square$ represents summation over the plaquettes of the square lattice. J is the energy cost of a Z_2 magnetic flux (vison) on a plaquette, and λ is the strength of the kinetic term of the gauge field. t_b, t_s are the hopping amplitudes of the holons and spinons, respectively; m_b and m_s are their masses. We will assume that $m_{b,s}$ are sufficiently large, such that the holons and spinons are gapped in the bulk. In addition to $U(1)$ spin and charge conservation, the Hamiltonian (A3) is invariant under local gauge transformations: $[\mathcal{H}, U_i] = 0$, where $U_i = \left(\prod_{j\in+_i}\sigma^x_{ij}\right)e^{i\pi(b^\dagger_i b_i + \sum_\alpha s^\dagger_{i\alpha}s_{j\alpha})}$ (j is a nearest neighbor site of i). We work in the sector $U_i = 1$; in this sector, a Z_2 version of Gauss' law is obeyed on every site.

Let us analyze the model (A3) in the limit $\lambda \ll J$, i.e., deep in the Z_2 QSL phase. In this limit, to zeroth order in λ/J, there are no magnetic fluxes in the ground state, i.e. $\prod_{\langle ij\rangle\in\square}\sigma^z_{ij}=1$ for every plaquette. Consider a cylindrical system with $L_x\times L_y$ sites and periodic boundary conditions along the y direction. As discussed in the main text, the gapped edges of the cylinder at $x=0,L_x$ are of the $m-$type. There are two degenerate ground states, corresponding to sectors with an even or odd magnetic flux through the holes of the cylinder. In the sector where the magnetic flux through the hole of the cylinder is zero, the we can always find a gauge for which $\sigma^z_{ij}=+1$ for all $\langle i,j\rangle$. (In the other sector with one magnetic flux through the hole, one can find a gauge in which all the $\sigma^z_{ij}=+1$, except along a single horizontal row.)

We now consider spin and charge conservation breaking perturbations on the edge. A proximity coupling of a superconductor to the edge can be represented by the term $\Delta\mathcal{H}_{\rm SC}=-\Delta\sum_{j\in\text{edge}}\left[\left(b^\dagger_j\right)^2+\text{H.c.}\right]$, creating a pair of charge e holons at the edge. The low-energy Hamiltonian describing the edge is then

$$\mathcal{H}_{\rm edge}=\sum_j\left[m_b b^\dagger_j b_j-t_b b^\dagger_j b_{j+\hat{y}}-\Delta\left(b^\dagger_j\right)^2+H.c.\right], \tag{A4}$$

where the summation runs over sites along the edge. Note that, after fixing the gauge, the local gauge invariance of the original Hamiltonian (A3) becomes a global gauge invariance under $b_j\to -b_j$ for all j. The Hamiltonian (A4) can be diagonalized by a Bugoliubov transformation. Upon increasing Δ, we find that the gap on the edge closes at $2\Delta=m_h-2\left|t_b\right|$. The vanishing of the gap signals a condensation of the holon field b_j. At larger values of Δ, the spectrum of (A4) contains imaginary frequencies, and interactions between the holons [neglected in Eq. (A3)] have to be included to retrieve stability. Presumably, the large Δ phase is a broken symmetry phase, in which $\langle b^\dagger_j b_{j+l}\rangle\to$ const. in the limit $l\to\infty$. This is the $e-$edge with condensed bosonic holons.

An analogous treatment in the case of an applied Zeeman field perpendicular to the z axis shows that for a sufficiently strong field, a transition to an $e-$edge with condensed bosonic spinons occurs.

b. Doubled Semion

It has recently been pointed out that the doubled semion state, described in the main text in terms of the matrix $K=\begin{pmatrix}2&0\\0&-2\end{pmatrix}$, can be understood in terms of Z_2 lattice gauge theory [47]. To understand this description, consider an interacting bosonic system which forms a Z_2 symmetry-protected topological (SPT) state [48]. This is a topologically non-trivial gapped Ising paramagnet, which is distinct from the conventional Ising paramagnet, and which has the property that as long as the Ising Z_2 symmetry is preserved, the edge has robust counterpropagating gapless modes. In other words, in the Z_2 SPT state, the only way to have a gapped edge is for the Z_2 global symmetry to be broken on the edge.

The doubled semion state can be understood as a state where the global Z_2 symmetry of the Z_2 SPT state has been promoted to a local, gauge symmetry. The gapped edge of the doubled semion state must therefore necessarily break the Z_2 gauge symmetry. That is, in contrast to the Z_2 sRVB state discussed above, the doubled semion state cannot support a gapped edge that preserves the Z_2 gauge symmetry. Therefore the doubled semion state has only one topological class of gapped edge.